DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 823 FL 003 209

TITLE	Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction: Report of the Second Annual Texas Conference on Coordinating Foreign Languages.
INSTITUTION	Texas Education Agency, Austin.
PUB DATE	Apr 72
NOTE	28p.; Conference held in Austin, Texas, February 7-8, 1972
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports; Educational Objectives; *Individualized Instruction; Instructional Materials; Instructional Program Divisions; *Language Instruction; Media Selection; *Modern Languages; Performance Criteria; Performance Factors; Programed Materials; Second Language Learning; Teacher Education; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This conference report contains a keynote address by Dr. Howard Altman, entitled "Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction: Theoretical and Practical Considerations," and five reports of the conference group sessions. Reports include: (1) "Techniques for Implementing Individualized Instruction," (2) "Performance Objectives," (3) "Developing and Adapting Materials," (4) "Testing and Grading," and (5) "Teacher Training." Selected references on individualized foreign language instruction and a list of conference participants are included. (RL)

ED 063823

REPORT

of the

SECOND ANNUAL TEXAS CONFERENCE

on

COORDINATING FOREIGN LANGUAGES

INDIVIDUALIZING FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Chariot Inn Motor Hotel

Austin

February 7-8, 1972

FL 003 209

Texas Education Agency

Austin

April 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

Introduction..... 2

Keynote Address: "Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction: Theoretical and Practical Considerations" -- Dr. Howard B. Altman, University of Washington..... 3

Reports of Group Sessions

Techniques for Implementing Individualized Instruction.....12

Performance Objectives.....14

Developing and Adapting Materials.....16

Testing and Grading.....18

Teacher Training.....20

Selected References on Individualized Foreign Language Instruction.....23

Participants.....25

INTRODUCTION

"Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction" was the topic selected by a majority of the participants in a survey prior to the Second Annual Texas Conference on Coordinating Foreign Languages. In accordance with this request, the Foreign Language Section of the Texas Education Agency secured the services of Dr. Howard B. Altman, Assistant Professor of German and Supervisor of Intern Teachers, University of Washington, as keynote speaker and consultant. Dr. Altman was director of the Stanford Conference on Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction in May, 1971. He is editor and author of several books and numerous articles on individualizing instruction, which appear in the list of selected references included in this report.

The keynote address which appears here is an abridged version of the one delivered at the conference. An attempt was made to include the most important points of the speech and to preserve the Altman style.

The reports of the group sessions reflect two days' work of discussing and synthesizing the selected topics. Each report represents the opinions and findings of the respective group. No group or combination of the participants would say that the conclusions reached are the final answers; it was the consensus that this conference merely "opened the door" to the possibilities of individualizing foreign language instruction.

It is hoped that this report will serve as a basis for further study in future conferences and workshops in Texas as well as the implementation of individualized foreign language programs in local schools as the need arises.

Division of Program Development
Dorothy Davidson, Director

Foreign Language Section

George M. Blanco — Program Director

Clara F. Gregory	Spanish
Bobby W. LaBouve	Latin
Arthur Baisch	German

INDIVIDUALIZING FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION: THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Howard B. Altman

I would like to talk to you this morning about several facets of individualizing instruction. I am going to start by giving you a rationale. I then am going to go on to a discussion of what individualizing instruction is and is not, and with the aid of some transparencies and slides I would like to show you something about the nature of the materials for individualizing instruction, a bit about the role of the teacher, and some words concerning the training of teachers. Then, depending on how much time I have, I would like to get into some issues such as grading and issuing credit and perhaps some warnings to keep in mind in considering individualization in foreign language instruction.

The theory of individualization is something that really doesn't need a rationale at all. We believe in individualization the way we believe in mother and apple pie and home. The problems come in, not in theory, but in practice. Those teachers, many of whom I have met and talked to around the country, have said to me, "I believe in individualization; I have been doing it; I have always done it." As a matter of fact this is true. Good teachers, good foreign language teachers, have always been attempting to tailor their instruction to the needs, abilities and interests of individual students in their classes. What has developed today is a methodology for doing this with large numbers of students simultaneously. Individualization is a response to student demands for a voice in the policies affecting their own lives. This, I suppose, is the primary rationale that one can give for individualizing instruction. Whether those demands are taking place in Seattle or in Austin, they are taking place. I think that all of us are aware that the Northeast Conference pointed out two years ago that today's student is a new student--a new student with new demands for relevance, for a say in the policies affecting his own life.

Individualization is a necessary outcome of the fact that people learn differently. They learn in different ways; they learn when they want to, and they don't learn when they don't want to, no matter what. Individualization is a recognition that students learn, if anything, precisely what they want to and need to learn. Dr. John B. Carroll, formerly of Harvard University and now with the Educational Testing Service, stated about five years ago that students learn, if anything, precisely what they are taught. I am sure that Carroll had a different group of students in mind, certainly a different philosophy of education in mind, when he made that statement.

Individualization, and here I'm getting very practical, is a response to the crisis in foreign language enrollment and morale.

Properly planned programs that I am in contact with are increasing in enrollment every year. Interestingly enough, within the same high school, if one language is individualized properly and other languages in the same department are not, the trend almost universally has been that students are flocking to the individualized program and leaving the non-individualized programs in droves. Finally, when properly implemented, individualization can go a long way toward solving our articulation problems. But here proper implementation is terribly important; in this case I mean an individualized program which stretches the length of the foreign language sequence, whereby students who start in one school or with one group of materials in one place can pick up in another program very easily because they have been taught how to learn.

Now what is individualization all about? What do we have in mind when we say this? Professor Robert L. Politzer, Stanford University, was probably the first to remark that there are three different phases of individualization of instruction. One can talk, first of all, of individualizing the rate of speed at which a student goes through the curriculum. Some people have claimed that giving the student all the time he needs is not enough, that individualization has got to be more than self-pacing. This is probably true, but I urge you to remember the importance of the time factor in learning. This is something that American education has never kept in mind. We have always assumed that people's learning ought to conform to the amount of time we give them in which to learn rather than adapting the amount of time we give them to how long it is going to take them to learn.

When John Carroll set up his model for school learning in 1963, he had several factors in mind. One of them he labeled aptitude, which he defined as the amount of time a student needs to achieve mastery under optimal conditions. A second factor is the opportunity to learn, which is the amount of time the school gives the student in which to learn. A third factor is the quality of instruction. Even this has a temporal component, quality of instruction being defined in part as the way materials are organized in sequence; whether an indirect object is taught before or after a direct object and so forth, again a time component. A fourth factor is the student's willingness to persevere, which is defined as the amount of time the student is willing to engage in active learning. Finally, the fifth factor is the ability to understand instructions. And you can see that of the five factors in this model four of them can be defined in terms of time. So let's not underestimate the role of time in the learning process.

A second phase of individualization is the individualization of the goals of instruction. We have been talking about individualizing the rate of instruction; one can also individualize the goals of instruction. This means that different students in the program have different goals in mind. And it is simply recognition in the curriculum that students come to the foreign language classroom with different interests in mind, with desires to learn different

things and for different purposes. Many foreign language teachers feel that it is difficult to talk about individualizing the goals of instruction right away. I myself have conceived of the foreign language curriculum in the form of a tree with a trunk and branches that go off in different directions and emanate from the tree at different points. The trunk might represent both the prerequisite learnings that a student has to bring with him in order to go off on his own branch. If a student does not have the necessary prerequisite learnings, then he will not be able to work semi-independently; he will be much too demanding of his teacher's time and will require entirely too much help. One teacher could never be able to work with a whole class full of people working on their own branches if these people had not brought with them the prerequisite skills to work alone or with one another for a great deal of the time.

A third phase of individualization is the phase that one would call individualizing the means of instruction. If the goals for all students in the curriculum remain the same, one can still advocate allowing students to approach those goals in different ways; this is, individualizing the means of getting to those goals. Some students learn inductively; others, deductively. Some people learn better visually; others, aurally. Not to recognize this and not to allow students to utilize those learning strategies which work best for them is to violate the principle of individualizing instruction.

Where I have examined a large number of programs of individualized instruction in northern California and elsewhere, especially in first and second year programs, I came up with four major characteristics which seem to define these programs. First of all, an individualized program seems to suggest self-pacing. Whether one individualizes the goals of instruction and the means of obtaining those goals, self-pacing the rate of instruction is always present.

This implies, secondly, that students take tests over their materials when they are ready and only over materials that they have studied. So the concept of a "sneak" quiz, of trying to trick the students, or of testing them on materials that they haven't prepared properly simply doesn't exist in the individualized programs that I have come into contact with. Incidentally, in many of these programs if the student, despite being prepared, doesn't do well on the test, he takes it again. People ask me at one point, "Isn't there a danger that students are going to cheat?" No, there is no danger that students are going to cheat if they know that they can take it again after they have had more preparation. The main thing seems to me isn't that we weed out those students that can't learn a foreign language; it is giving the greatest possible opportunity to all students to learn a foreign language. This means that some people are going to take more time to do it and some are going to have to take the test twice before they get a decent grade.

The third characteristic is that when students need help, they work individually with their teacher, someone else in the room, possibly an advanced student, a teaching assistant or some sort of tutor. The

function of teaching, as Professor Leon Jakobovits has pointed out in a recent book, is to compensate the student in his learning difficulties. The student learns; the teacher doesn't so much teach as allows the student to learn; and when the student is having difficulty with his learning, the teacher has to step in and offer professional assistance.

Fourth, individualized programs seem to be based on the notion of performance objectives. The students know the tasks assigned to them, they know what they have to do for each task, and they know how accurately and under what conditions they have to demonstrate that they have performed the task. They know, also, that until they have demonstrated to criterion, that is, to the level of achievement required, they will not be allowed to go on to anything else. So keep in mind from that model of school learning that if the quality of instruction is high, the student is willing to persevere, his ability to understand the instruction is in order and the school gives him an opportunity to learn, his aptitude is simply the amount of time it is going to take him to learn. Students with high aptitude will take less time; students with low aptitude will take more time. Students with minimal aptitude will take an indefinite amount of time, which our school curriculum will simply not give them; so we claim that they cannot learn. I think we have to modify that to say that they cannot learn under existing school conditions. Individualization is not allowing each student to do his own thing, and this is important. Individualization has a certain structure to it. Those programs which are well-structured, which have been well thought out are working very well; they are growing in enrollment; students are satisfied and teachers are satisfied but tired.

Those programs--and I have observed too many of them--those programs in which the teacher or the administration of the school or college, for that matter, made the decision on Friday afternoon to start individualizing instruction Monday morning, are not holding their students. What happened in one case was that on the first day of class the teacher turned to the students as the bell was about to ring, having explained the philosophy of instruction for individualization, said, "Okay, class, when you come back tomorrow, let me know what you want to do this year." You can well imagine that the teacher was ready to unconvert very quickly after the following class.

Individualization does not necessarily mean that each student works alone or that students work on a one-to-one basis with their teacher. One of the points we tried to make at the Stanford Conference last May was that individualization means tailoring instruction to the needs of students regardless of whether they work alone or in groups of any size. The critical variable, then, is that instruction is given to people only when they require or request it. For it is only at that time that they can best benefit from it. In other words, frequently many people in the class need exactly the same thing or they are interested in the same goals. Don't assume that in a class of 30 students you might have to teach how to form the direct object 30 different times in the same period or in the same week; you won't.

First of all students won't be at the same place in that curriculum. Second, not everyone will even need your explanation. Third, some of them will need an explanation twice as complex, and you'll have to give individual help to such people or see to it that they can get it elsewhere.

Individualization is not necessarily programed instruction in the classical sense of programing, the Skinnerian sense. Although programed instruction, as Professor Theodore Mueller, of the University of Kentucky, once pointed out, may well be a first step toward individualizing learning. Programed instruction might almost be taken synonymously with individualizing instruction in the sense that Albert Valdman used the term when he referred to "guided learning" or John Carroll, when he referred to "designed learning," in other words, tailoring the curriculum to the needs and abilities of students.

Individualizing really cannot be defined in any clearcut way. Its definition has got to be pluralistic. The definition for an individualized program in a Texas high school may very well be different from that of an individualized program in a Seattle high school. The needs, resources and abilities of people in a local area determine how the program is going to look and the dimensions it is going to have. What I have been suggesting in terms of the characteristics of beginning programs are those which have now vested themselves in many programs, but they don't have to be there in any specific program. Lorraine Strasheim is fond of saying that one can individualize with a desk and a pencil, and this is really true.

Since I have mentioned desks and pencils, I've come to the topic of materials for individualization. There are three main qualities of the materials for an individualized program. They must be <u>clear</u> first of all. If the students cannot understand the materials, then they cannot work semi-independently. They might as well not have them at all; they might as well have a teacher lecturing to them. Second, the materials have got to be accessible; if the students can't get at them, they are worthless. This refers not only to textbooks; it also refers to any machinery which is available to students. I realize that in many schools--and indeed in all college classrooms--the rooms are not necessarily used only for French, Spanish or German; other classes have to come in the next hour, so we can't leave the tape recorders and whatever lying around the room. These are local problems for which only local solutions can be devised. I would advocate, however, that if you have machinery and your students are not deliberately breaking everything--if they are you might investigate why--then make the machinery, the textbooks, the practice tests, all of your materials in the program accessible to students. Remember if they have to interrupt you when you are working with someone else, they have taken away your time that you, as the expert, cannot afford to give to such tasks. Third, materials have to be varied. Keeping in mind that people learn in different ways, we must have materials which allow them to learn in different ways. Individualization does not mean that you have to throw away the textbooks that you have now. Nor does it mean that you have to buy a complete

set of 30 copies of all of the major textbooks. This is unrealistic; no school administration is ever going to buy a complete set of everything. Second, you really don't need a complete set of a dozen different books. You might very beneficially have several copies of many different books, but remember many students do learn in similar ways, especially in lower division foreign language classes. If you do have some choice, I think this is all anyone can realistically expect. What you may have to do with many of these books is adapt them to the needs of the students. Adapting existing materials is probably one of the most important tasks of the teacher in an individualized foreign language program. There are many ways in which you can adapt such materials.

In adapting existing materials one has to not only consider individualizing a textbook by devising checklists to orient the students to the materials, but one has to do several other things. Practice tests should be developed to allow students an opportunity to test themselves at frequent points so that they know whether they are learning. These tests can be administered by you, teaching assistants or students to one another. They don't count on the student's grade; they simply give him the opportunity to make sure that he is where he is supposed to be and to determine if he understands the material clearly. Second, the publisher's tapes that accompany textbooks frequently leave a lot to be desired for the needs of an individualized program. They are either too long or contain a lot of excess material. You have the obligation to take these tapes, cut out the excess, rearrange the parts and, if you have the facilities, to put some of the taped materials on cassettes, making them available to students; you might want to put some of your own "star" presentations on cassettes and let students listen to them when they need them.

Not only is it necessary to adapt existing materials, but as time goes on, our professionals will be developing brand new materials for the individualized classroom. Incidentally, let me mention some of the adaptations of materials that are available. The McCluer High School in Florissant, Missouri, has taken the Holt series of Spanish, French, and German books and divided the material into individual pamphlets. This material is available if you wish to write to Innovative Curricula, Inc., Box 273, Florissant, Missouri 63032. Some new textbooks have come out and are coming out. In German, D. C. Heath will publish a series of texts written by Gerald Logan for individualized German programs. There are a couple of Spanish textbooks, one of which is Spanish for Communication, published by Houghton Mifflin Company. The Independent Learning Systems in San Rafael, California, has published a series of packets including students' manuals--this is now in the second edition--for individualizing the first year of the Spanish program. I don't know whether there are any individualized materials in preparation for French, but I have no doubt that there are.

In terms of adapting or of developing new materials, many teachers have prepared a series of learning kits or packets which have one specific objective in mind: They give the student a practice test

and they allow him to learn to master the material. At Live Oak High School in Morgan Hill, California, Mr. Gerald Logan has designed a curriculum which consists of some 44 separate German courses. Taught by two full-time teachers and a part-time paraprofessional, there are 270 students in this program. It took him years to develop the curriculum in full detail for all of these courses, and he works at it constantly. I have a couple of copies of Logan's curriculum guide in German. You can get copies of this by simply writing to Gerald Logan at Live Oak High School, Morgan Hill, California.

One of the important things that the teacher has to do is keep records of how students are doing. You can see from some of these transparencies the various types of forms that have to be developed so that students' records of progress can be maintained. One of the things that Jim Short at Capuchino High School, San Bruno, California, realized was necessary was sending home letters to parents occasionally, orienting them to the program, letting them know how the students were doing, and explaining that in this program the standard grade is A. When a student has mastered his material to a 90 or 95 percent accuracy, he receives a grade of A in this program, and until he has mastered his material to that degree of accuracy he doesn't receive a grade at all. The individualized instructional approach of the German program in the Capuchino High School is moving toward an emphasis on learning to learn a foreign language.

I want to talk a little about the role of the teacher. Florence Steiner has said that the foreign language teacher has traditionally functioned as an indicational broadcaster. In an individualized program, on the other hand, the teacher functions somewhat differently. Let me state a few functions which I feel that the teacher fulfills in an individualized program. First, the teacher works as a resource person in an individualized program, as a person to whom a student may go for advice, for encouragement, for help or simply for a sympathetic ear. Second, the teacher prepares curriculum materials for semi-independent learners, especially for those people who have reached level three or four. Third, the teacher sets up learning steps to the basic materials by giving students a basic textbook, which almost every school will have for the first year. These texts ought to be so adapted that students know how to go through them on their own. That doesn't mean that they will spend all the time working alone; it simply means that they know what is expected of them. Fourth, the teacher sets up and coordinates conversation groups and other group activities for oral work.

One of the failings which individualized programs seem to have--many of them in the first years in which they were developed and that isn't really that long ago--was that there was no real provision made for the development of communicative competence. What some have done now is to build opportunities for students to communicate with other students by practicing speaking together. Obviously language is communication. By working with a packet or listening to a tape, a student is not going to learn to speak Spanish. There have to be some opportunities for people to communicate and converse in real-life situations.

Live Oak High School is located in Morgan Hill, California, which is a small rural community in the northern part of the state. It is predominantly Spanish-speaking; there are about 100 students studying Spanish and 270 studying German. German is individualized; Spanish is not. One of the things Logan did was to require each student to participate in at least one group with no more than six students in the group for an hour a week. These groups are conducted either by one of the two faculty, by the part-time paraprofessional or by one of the 20 advanced students in the program who function as teacher aides. Fifth, the teacher adapts all the basic materials, such as textbook, tapes, and tests as needed. Sixth, the teacher makes hardware accessible and trains all students to use all of the machines. Actually the students should learn how to use the machines at the beginning of the year. If you have to interrupt your work in helping someone thread a tape, you are wasting your time as a teacher in the program. Teach the students how to operate the machinery in the beginning. Seventh, the teacher prepares meaningful software for use with these machines. If the tapes that come with your textbooks are dull, too long, if they need to be cut and resequenced, this is your job as the expert in the program. Eighth, the teacher works with individuals, groups of different sizes, or the whole class as needed. Ninth, the teacher tests the students both formally and informally as needed, mostly informally. Formal tests really don't accomplish much more than to certify that the student has reached a certain level of proficiency. Tenth, the teacher constructs practice tests--this is part of the adapting materials--tests that students can take alone or with other students. Eleventh, and you can imagine how important this is, whenever possible, the teacher delegates some of the teaching and testing to teaching assistants, students even in that same classroom who are doing well and who want an opportunity to work as a teacher, or native-speaking paraprofessionals from the community, many of whom can be found to work in public schools an hour or more a day at no cost. There are mothers who are just delighted to have an opportunity to come in and work in schools. You realize the expertise that you have in your program and you have far more people to handle the teaching tasks. Lastly, the teacher serves as a record keeper and this is very important to the program where students are working at different points in the curriculum or indeed on different things in the curriculum.

In summary the teacher in an individualized classroom is not unlike an activities director. He sees to it that students know the options that are open to them and that they know what is expected of them in each option, and it is his job to provide whatever help and encouragement are needed to allow students to work as smoothly as possible.

Let me close with these points. Individualized instruction as we know today is not a panacea; it will not necessarily cure enrollment problems; it will not cure morale; it will probably mean much more work for the teacher; it may very well prove to be more expensive, especially intitally, in the development of materials. It is going to be a lot of work, so don't rush in without doing much thinking. The

first and most important stage in individualizing instruction, and I cannot stress this too strongly, is that you sit down and you plan, that you ask yourself, "What do I want to have my students do? What do they want to do? What resources do we have available to us in our school or can we create? What can we do with what we have, what goals do we want to establish, how are we going to get to those goals?" Until you do some sufficient planning, until you have thought out what you want to do and what you want to have the students to do, if you attempt any mass individualization or if you come in on Monday morning and simply start, I can predict chaos, because individualization, as I mentioned before, does not mean doing away with structure. It is simply a different type of structure. It does not mean doing away with pressure of students to learn. The pressure is just as much there; there may be even more pressure, because students now in individualized programs want to learn, not so much to please the teacher, but to please themselves and their peers. Individualization implies instruction, and please keep that in mind; there are two words in the phrase individualizing instruction and they both have to be stressed. If you simply allow the students to do their own thing, you are not giving any instruction; you are abrogating your role as teacher in the classroom. Individualization of instruction means that you have to provide instruction when it is needed.

REPORTS OF GROUP SESSIONS

Techniques for Implementing Individualized Instruction

Introductory statement:

This group focused on the problem of implementing individualized instruction from the viewpoint of the teacher interested in initiating such a program based upon rate of learning, but recognizing varying abilities and motivation.

Statement of problem:

- where to begin
- how to individualize
- how credit is to be given if self-pacing is used
- how to maintain motivation or incentive for progressing
- how to develop on the part of the student an acceptance of responsibility for his own learning

Recommendations:

The teacher should

- establish goals which are the result of mutual agreement with other teachers and students. These should be the expected outcomes for the entire program--the long-range goals.
- establish a continuum of performance objectives throughout all levels
- begin with one class or level--that for which he has the most material already available
- establish learning objectives for each unit of work
- prepare a variety of learning activities to implement the objectives. These learning activities, along with the performance objectives for each unit of work, will then comprise a "learning packet." In developing a set of activities and exercises, the teacher should consider the varying means by which students learn and should plan a variety of activities to meet all student needs. He must also structure activities so that students work alone, on a one-to-one basis with the teacher, with other students, and in groups for oral interaction. This last activity is the culmina-

tion which serves as an evaluation of accomplishment of specific performance objectives. Students should be directed to a variety of equipment and materials, including tapes, cassettes, slides, filmstrips, transparencies, pictures, etc., to help them accomplish their learning tasks, and, in addition, they should have ready access to a variety of enrichment materials, such as records, tapes, magazines, newspapers, books, etc.

Conclusion:

The importance of preplanning for individualized instruction cannot be overstressed. A full year, if possible, or at least a semester of planning is essential for gathering and developing materials and a variety of learning resources for students, once goals and performance objectives have been established. The planning process, however, must allow for continual evaluation of the program, which should be constantly subject to change.

Structuring of material is also vital, with minimum performance standards and time limits imposed, particularly until the student develops the self-discipline necessary to accept responsibility for his own learning. Time limits should, however, be determined according to the needs and abilities of slow to average students, not faster ones.

Teachers must accept administrative limitations on scheduling, grading, and facilities in initiating an individualized program; however within these limitations, furniture may be rearranged, a variety of materials and equipment may be gathered, and self-tests may be developed for student use.

The teacher must plan for communication with both students and parents in order to acquaint them with the new program and its purposes. A letter explaining the program should be sent home or parent-teacher meetings might be held in order to enable parents to understand what the teacher hopes to accomplish and how he plans to do so.

Sherrill Fisk, Chairman
Spring Branch Public Schools

Mary B. Gibson, Recorder
Amarillo Public Schools

Participants:

Carolyn Christopher, Fort Worth Public Schools
LeRoy Ellis, Lamar University
Sister James Elizabeth González, Our Lady of the Lake
Nannette K. Jarrell, Texas City Public Schools
Olivia Muñoz, Houston Public Schools
Edward H. Nichols, Andrews Public Schools
Tomás Rivera, The University of Texas at San Antonio
Lillian Shirley, Midland Public Schools
Ruth Stevens, Irving Public Schools

Performance Objectives

Introductory statement:

It is imperative for a truly successful individualized instruction program that the performance objectives be clearly stated before instruction begins. Teachers need training in this particular area if they are to become effective implementors of the individualized program.

Statement of the problem:

If the individualized approach to foreign language learning and teaching is to be successful

- the teacher must be able to apply the principles of performance objectives to the operation of the program
- a high degree of specificity in the performance objectives is required
- the performance objectives, to be well written, must contain the following four components:
  - WHAT -- the specific BEHAVIOR exhibited when the objective is accomplished
  - WHO -- a specific statement of the INDIVIDUAL(S) who will exhibit the behavior
  - HOW -- specific PERFORMANCE CONDITIONS under which the behavior will occur
  - MEASUREMENT -- the specific CRITERIA OF SUCCESS to be obtained. What evidence will be accepted as proof that the objective has been achieved?
- students must be involved in setting up objectives and determining criteria of success, although the teacher will have general goals and objectives in mind. This involvement will answer the need to make every language course a significant personal experience, with topics relevant to the students' interests.

Recommendations:

- Teachers and educators in general should be fully aware of what constitutes a usefully stated performance objective.
- The Education Service Centers should provide inservice workshops for teachers on writing performance objectives.

- All foreign language teachers should be provided with samples of properly constructed performance objectives before being expected to compile their own.

- Experts should be engaged to help set up acceptable performance objectives to be presented to textbook publishers, and the choice of State-adopted books should be made on the basis of these objectives.

Conclusion:

Any successful individualized instructional program is securely based on effectively constructed performance objectives which point out to the student the goals of his course, the means to attain these objectives, and the method of knowing when he has reached his aim successfully. There is a great need to motivate and interest students if language enrollments are to be maintained and increased.

Bibliography

Cavanagh, Peter and Cline Jones (Eds.), Yearbook of Educational and Instructional Techniques 1969-70, Incorporating Programmes in Print, Cornmarket Press Ltd., 1969.

Esbensen, Thorwald. Working with Individualized Instruction. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1968.

Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools. California State Advisory Committee on Foreign Languages. Sacramento, California: Office of State Printing, 1972.

Four County Committee on Behavioral Objectives. California, 1969.

Gronlund, Norman E. Stating Behavioral Objectives for Classroom Instruction. New York: Macmillan Company, 1970.

Mager, Robert F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Belmont, California: Fearon Publishers, 1962.

Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Committee of College and University Examiners. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956.

Robert Carter, Chairman
Midland Public Schools

Sister Pauline Nugent, Recorder
Incarnate Word High School

Participants:

Venita Booth, Corpus Christi Public Schools
Jack A. Dabbs, Texas A and M University
Doris Galush, The University of Texas at Austin

Bobby W. LaBouve, Texas Education Agency
Maurine P. Magnon, San Antonio Public Schools
Barney H. Webber, Goose Creek Public Schools
Cynthia Woodland, Cypress-Fairbanks Public Schools

Developing and Adapting Materials for Individualized Instruction

Introductory statement:

The degree of success in adapting and developing materials for an individualized instructional program is in direct proprotion to the amount, variety, and quality of materials available for adaptation.

Statement of the problem:

At the present time there are not sufficient available materials specifically designed for individualized instruction; therefore there is no other recourse except to adapt existing materials. To do this, the teacher must

- examine the textbook presentation and subdivide it into logical, pedagogically sound sub-units. These sub-units may be either those found in the text or a refined sub-unit (based on the text) tailored to the students' individual needs and interests.

- sequence and present these sub-units in such a way that the student is totally aware of both the most efficient learning techniques expected as well as the objectives of the sub-unit. The sequencing and directions are to be simple enough to allow the student maximum self-direction and the maintenance of continuity.

- edit or rework completely commercially available tapes to supplement the individual sub-units. These "mini-tapes" could be put on three-inch reels or cassettes and packaged with the sub-units. Workbook materials (from the publisher) as well as other supplementary aids (visuals, etc.) could be integrated at this point. It is envisioned that the lock-step console approach in the traditional language laboratory will be modified in favor of the language lab-library with multiple copies of taped material for every sub-unit available for individual use.

- evaluate each sub-unit by both oral and written means. Alternate forms of the written tests will be made available to those students who fail to perform optimally on their first attempt.

- require frequent conversation group participation

to provide the students with an opportunity for oral practice and to allow evaluation of oral-aural skills. This is to be practical and diagnostic in scope.

- make available auxiliary materials dictated by the students' peripheral interests in other areas: history, music, art, science, math, etc. This knowledge might be evaluated through guiding the conversation groups into these areas.

- assure that adequate planning and exhaustive preparation receive sufficient emphasis to ensure the maintenance of student interest, participation and motivation. Sub-units must be prepared in great enough advanced numbers to ensure that the fast-working, highly motivated student is continually challenged by increasingly more difficult materials in sufficient quantity that he does not outpace the teacher's efforts in preparing and adapting materials for him. From an administrative point of view, extensive pre-planning of student check lists, grading forms, and progress reports to parents must be devised, and staff and students must be familiarized with their use. Again responsibility is shifted as much as possible to the student to conserve teacher time. An adequate filing system must be devised to implement this evaluation.

Recommendation:

The committee recommends that the Texas Education Agency Foreign Language Section request publishers of State-adopted textbooks in each of the target languages to develop sample individualized instructional packets. These could be one unit, or packet, for each level of each language and could serve as models for further packets to be developed by teachers.

Loyd Guidry, Chairman
East Texas State University

Emily Dawson, Recorder
Midland Public Schools

Participants:

Laurel A. Briscoe, The University of Texas at Austin
Jane Crow, Cypress-Fairbanks Public Schools
Richard Esler, St. Mark's School of Texas
Guillermo García, Midwestern University
Constance Hulbert, Ysleta Public Schools
Sister Clara Kliesen, Our Lady of the Lake
Dora Sáenz, Laredo Public Schools
Lorum H. Stratton, Texas Tech University

Testing and Grading

Introductory statement:

It was the consensus of the committee that preliminary to the assignment of a student to a level of ability, standardized, commercially available tests should be given: prognostic tests for students with no previous foreign language experience and diagnostic tests for the others.

Statement of the problem:

It was recognized that current commercial tests are inadequate, but that no present alternative was feasible. It was also noted that if grading reform is not curriculum-wide, some lessening of competitive motivation may be anticipated in the foreign language class as pressure for deadlines is relaxed in that area only. This should be foreseen and accepted.

Recommendations:

- All testing in the program should comprehend both the recognition and productive components of the language, including listening, speaking, reading and writing.

- Tests for measuring the student's achievement of the performance objectives of the program should be teacher-made.

- Self-tests in reading and writing and taped and paraprofessional- or teacher-assisted tests in speaking and listening should be abundantly available to the student as he progresses through a unit. The purpose of such tests is for the student to measure his own progress, not for a grade.

- Unit tests, insofar as possible, should be prepared jointly by the department faculty, including the paraprofessionals, to ensure maximum objectivity and conformity. Particular concern was expressed that all tests measure performance in relation to objectives clearly defined in standards established at the beginning of the program. The criterion-referenced test, which ascertains whether the student has mastered specific skills and content, should replace the norm-referenced achievement test.

- A student should know when he is to be tested, what he is to be tested on, and, as soon as possible, how he performed.

- At intervals a student is to be evaluated on his language performance according to the objectives established for him. The continuing profile thus

secured becomes part of the student's confidential file to be used for diagnostic purposes and as a part of his transcript and permanent record, but not as a part of a "public" total class progress record.

. When the student meets the minumum standard set for a unit, he should receive a letter grade of B. Superior or extraordinary work beyond the standard should be rewarded with an A. A gradual de-emphasis of concern for the "public" letter grade in favor of more attention to actual performance in the language was urged.

Special Notation:

The committee's attention was deliberately centered on the problems and solutions to testing and grading at the secondary level because it was felt that improvement at that level would effectively contribute to better placement practices in the colleges and universities and would ultimately result in advanced students of sounder motivation.

Bibliography

Lado, Robert. Language Testing. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1961.

Shurk, J. A. German Handbook. Capuchino High School, San Bruno, California, (undated.)

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Valette, Rebecca M. Modern Language Testing, A Handbook. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967.

Julia K. Mellenbruch, Chairman
Austin Public Schools

Gerald P. Doyle, Recorder
Beaumont Public Schools

Participants:

Ray Ellis, Hardin-Simmons University
William Herold, The University of Texas at Austin
Edward J. Hinojosa, San Antonio Public Schools
Laura Richards, Midland Public Schools
Harold Simpson, East Texas State University
Héctor Urrutibéheity, Rice University

Teacher Training

Introductory Statement:

Viewed within the framework of individualized instruction, the preparation of the classroom teacher of foreign languages involves

- consideration of psychological principles of learning experienced by the students to whom he is teaching the foreign language as well as
- consideration of the curriculum point of view: namely, what is taught, how it is taught, the textbook, teaching materials, and equipment utilized, how it is articulated and the problems involved. Finally,
- consideration of the teacher himself. What is his role in individualizing instruction, and what preparation is involved in the attainment of competence as the expert, the guide to learning, and the handler of the hardware and software involved in individualized instruction?

Statement of the problem:

- The training of language teachers frequently does not prepare them to be bilingual or to have near-native proficiency in the foreign language.
- They need further training in the use and handling of audiovisual and other media equipment and ability to train students in their use.
- Acquaintance with methods and learning theories involved in individualized instruction is needed.
- Knowledge of the history, art, and culture of the areas where the foreign language is spoken is frequently lacking.
- Some teachers lack the humanistic qualities which enable them to relate to their students, the empathy which gives them the pedagogical sensitivity needed to foster the necessary rapport.
- Competence is needed also in planning the units realistically, in evaluating the work, in articulating the learning units, in adapting the amount of time to the task, in tailoring instruction to the needs of the student, in making directions clear and precise.

- The proper personality and ability to interact with students necessary in individualizing instruction are difficult to find.

Recommendations:

Teacher training should

- provide near-native proficiency in the language
- acquaint the teacher with the history, culture, art and civilization of the areas where the foreign language is used for communication
- alert him to the diverse reading materials and the specialized vocabulary used in other disciplines
- include foreign residence or travel with college credit for contrastive study when possible
- make him proficient in the use of hardware and software associated with foreign language instruction
- make him sensitive to the needs of all students, including those who are not future foreign language majors
- enable him to choose or construct meaningful and realistic tests and evaluations
- familiarize him with both the curriculum of his own training and that of the schools
- enable him to choose, to train, and to supervise aides, student assistants, and paraprofessional personnel to help him with his instructional guidance
- help him to maintain a learning atmosphere in the classroom
- make him receptive to suggestions of supervisory personnel
- provide him with ability to rework and adapt teaching materials to be of benefit to his class in achieving performance goals

Implementation through workshops should be a cooperative effort involving the universities, the Texas Education Agency, the education service centers, and the local school districts.

Conclusion:

Through the individualization of instruction, teacher trainers are to produce a teacher who

- knows the foreign language, its culture, literature and civilization
- surpasses mimimum State certification requirements
- is a true representative of the language
- possesses the humanistic attitude necessary for communicating the subject matter to and developing the skills of the learner

The prospective teacher who has been both involved in an individualized instructional program and trained in its techniques will be prepared to implement the program in the classroom.

Joseph H. Michel, Chairman
The University of Texas at Austin

Margaret W. Ruse, Recorder
Houston Public Schools

Participants:

Arthur Baisch, The University of Texas at Austin and the Texas Education Agency
Elizabeth Brandon, University of Houston
John H. Hammond, Texas Christian University
Minnie Henderson, Mary-Hardin Baylor College
H. H. Johns, Jr., Dallas Public Schools
Salvador Siqueiros, El Paso Public Schools

SELECTED REFERENCES ON INDIVIDUALIZED FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Books

Altman, Howard B. and Robert L. Politzer, eds. Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction: Proceedings of the Stanford Conference. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 1971.

Altman, Howard B., ed. Individualized Foreign Language Instruction: A Book of Readings. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, forthcoming.

Gougher, Ronald L., ed. Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction: A Practical Guide. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development, Inc., 1972.

Articles

Altman, Howard B. "Individualized Foreign Language Instruction: What Does It Mean?" Foreign Language Annals 4:4 (May, 1971), pages 421-22.

_____. "Toward a Definition of Individualized Foreign Language Instruction," American Foreign Language Teacher 1:3 (February, 1971), pages 12-14.

_____ and Arnulfo G. Ramírez. "Beyond Micro-Teaching: Some First Steps in Individualizing Preservice Training for Foreign Language Teachers," Modern Language Journal 55:5 (May, 1971), pages 276-80.

Benardo, Leo. "Individual Differences in Foreign Language Learning in the Junior High School," in Marvin Wasserman, ed., Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Annual Foreign Language Conference at New York University. New York: New York University, 1966, pages 12-14.

Carroll, John B. "Individual Differences in Foreign Language Learning," in Marvin Wasserman, ed., Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Annual Foreign Language Conference at New York University. New York: New York University, 1966, pages 3-11.

Bockman, John F. and Ronald L. Gougher, eds. Individualization of Foreign Language Learning in America. A continuing Newsletter published by West Chester State College, West Chester, Pennsylvania. Bockman and Gougher also edit a continuing column on "Individualized Instruction" in Foreign Language Annals.

Jakobovits, Leon A. "Procedural Steps in Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction, "Foreign Language Annals 5:1 (October, 1971), pages 96-98.

Jarvis, Gilbert A. "Individualized Learning--Where Can We Risk Compromise?" Modern Language Journal 55:6 (October, 1971), pages 375-78.

Logan, Gerald E. "A Comment on Including Culture in an Individualized Foreign Language Program," Foreign Language Annals 5:1 (October, 1971), pages 99-101.

_____. "Curricula for Individualized Instruction," in Dale L. Lange, ed., Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education, Volume II. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1970, pages 133-55.

McLennan, Robert. "How Do We Allow Foreign Language Students to Learn at Optimum Rates?" American Foreign Language Teacher 1:3 (February, 1971), pages 8-11.

Politzer, Robert L. "Toward Individualization in Foreign Language Teaching," Modern Language Journal 55:4 (April, 1971), pages 207-12.

Reinert, Harry. "Practical Guide to Individualization, "Modern Language Journal 55:3 (March, 1971), pages 156-63.

Shepherd, W. Everitt. "An Experiment in Individualized Advanced French," Foreign Language Annals 3:3 (March, 1970), pages 394-99.

Strasheim, Lorraine A. "A Rationale for the Individualization and Personalization of Foreign Language Instruction," in Dale L. Lange, ed., Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education, Volume II. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1970, pages 15-34.

_____. "Is Foreign-Language Study Relevant for American Students in the 1970's?" in Sanford Newell, ed., Dimension: Languages 70. Proceedings of the Sixth Southern Conference on Language Teaching. New York: MLA-ACTFL Materials Center, 1970, pages 24-35.

Steiner, Florence. "Individualized Instruction," Modern Language Journal 55:6 (October, 1971), pages 361-74.

_____. "Performance Objectives in the Teaching of Foreign Languages." Foreign Language Annals 3:4 (May, 1970), pages 579-591.

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Howard B. Altman
Assistant Professor of German
University of Washington
340-C Denny Hall
Seattle, Washington 98105

Mrs. Venita Booth, Consultant
Foreign Languages
Division of Instruction
Corpus Christi I.S.D.
Post Office Drawer 110
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403

Dr. Elizabeth Brandon, Supervisor
Teacher Education, French
University of Houston
Houston, Texas 77004

Dr. Laurel A. Briscoe
Assistant Professor of
Curriculum and Instruction
Foreign Language Education Center
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Mr. Robert Carter, Coordinator
Foreign Languages
Midland I.S.D.
702 North "N"
Midland, Texas 79701

Miss Carolyn Christopher, Editor
Department of Curriculum
Fort Worth I.S.D.
3210 Lancaster
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

Mrs. Jane Crow, Coordinator
Foreign Language Department
Cypress-Fairbanks I.S.D.
Box 40040
Houston, Texas 77040

Dr. Jack A. Dabbs, Head
Department of Modern Languages
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas 77840

Mrs. Emily Dawson, Chairman
Foreign Language Department
Midland High School
Midland, Texas 79701

Mr. Gerald P. Doyle
Teacher of Latin
Beaumont High School
Beaumont, Texas 77702

Dr. LeRoy Ellis, Head
Department of Modern Languages
Lamar University
Box 10049, Lamar University Station
Beaumont, Texas 77710

Dr. Ray Ellis, Head
Foreign Language Department
Hardin-Simmons University
Abilene, Texas 79601

Mr. Richard Esler, Chairman
Foreign Language Department
St. Mark's School of Texas
10600 Preston Road
Dallas, Texas 75230

Mrs. Sherrill Fisk, Coordinator
Foreign Languages
Spring Branch I.S.D.
955 Campbell Road
Houston, Texas 77024

Miss Doris Galush
Teaching Assistant and Supervisor
of Student Teachers
Foreign Language Education Center
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Dr. Guillermo García, Chairman
Foreign Language Department
Midwestern University
3400 Taft
Wichita Falls, Texas 76308

Mrs. Mary B. Gibson, Chairman
Foreign Language Department
Amarillo High School
Amarillo, Texas 79101

Sister James Elizabeth González
Chairman, Foreign Language
Department
Our Lady of the Lake College
411 Southwest 24th Street
San Antonio, Texas 78207

Dr. Loyd Guidry, Supervisor
Foreign Language Student Teachers
East Texas State University
ETSU Station
Commerce, Texas 75428

Miss Minnie Henderson, Chairman
Foreign Language Department
Mary Hardin-Baylor College
Box 658
Belton, Texas 76513

Dr. William R. Herold
Assistant Professor of
Foreign Language Education
Foreign Language Education Center
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Mr. Edward J. Hinojosa
Teacher of Spanish
Whittier Junior High School
San Antonio, Texas 78201

Mrs. Constance Hulbert, Supervisor
Foreign Language Section
Ysleta I.S.D.
8445 Valdespino
El Paso, Texas 79907

Dr. John H. Hammond, Chairman
Foreign Language Department
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas 76129

Mrs. Nannette K. Jarrell, Chairman
Foreign Language Department
Texas City High School
Texas City, Texas 77590

Dr. H. H. Johns, Jr., Supervisor
Foreign Language Section
Dallas I.S.D.
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204

Sister Clara Kliesen, Director
English as a Foreign Language
Our Lady of the Lake College
411 Southwest 24th Street
San Antonio, Texas 78207

Mrs. Maurine P. Magnon
Teacher of Spanish
Edison High School
701 Santa Monica Street
San Antonio, Texas 78212

Mrs. Julia K. Mellenbruch, Chairman
Foreign Language Department
Austin High School
1212 Rio Grande
Austin, Texas 78701

Dr. Joseph H. Michel, Director
Foreign Language Education Center
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Mrs. Olivia Muñoz, Director
Foreign Language Instruction
Houston I.S.D.
3830 Richmond Avenue
Houston, Texas 77027

Mr. Edward H. Nichols, Chairman
Foreign Language Department
Andrews High School
Andrews, Texas 79714

Sister Pauline Nugent, Chairman
Language Department
Incarnate Word High School
727 E. Hildebrand
San Antonio, Texas 78284

Miss Mary Lee Poindexter, Consultant
Foreign Languages
Fort Worth I.S.D.
3210 Lancaster
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

Dr. Dona Reeves
Professor of German
Southwest Texas State University
SWTSU Station, Box 1002
San Marcos, Texas 78666

Mrs. Laura Richards, Chairman
Foreign Language Department
R.E. Lee High School
Midland, Texas 79701

Dr. Tomás Rivera
Professor of Romance Languages
University of Texas at San Antonio
600 Plaza Way
San Antonio, Texas 78205

Mrs. Margaret W. Ruse, Consultant
Foreign Language Instruction
Houston I.S.D.
3830 Richmond Avenue
Houston, Texas 77027

Miss Dora Sáenz, Chairman
Foreign Language Department
Martin High School
Laredo, Texas 78040

Mrs. Lillian A. Shirley
Teacher of Spanish
Alamo Junior High School
Midland, Texas 79701

Dr. Harold Simpson, Chairman
Foreign Language Department
East Texas State University
ETSU Station
Commerce, Texas 75428

Mr. Salvador Siqueiros, Consultant
Mexican-American Education
El Paso I.S.D.
Post Office Box 1710
El Paso, Texas 79999

Miss Ruth Stevens, Consultant
Foreign Languages
Irving I.S.D.
P. O. Box 637
Irving, Texas 75060

Dr. Lorum H. Stratton
Assistant Professor of Spanish
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Dr. Héctor Urrutibéheity
Assistant Professor of French
and Spanish
Rice University
Houston, Texas 77001

Mr. Barney H. Webber, Coordinator
Foreign Languages
Goose Creek Consolidated I.S.D.
Sterling High School
Post Office Drawer 30
Baytown, Texas 77521

Mrs. Cynthia Woodland
Teacher of Spanish
Cypress-Fairbanks High School
Box 40040
Houston, Texas 77040